

debatable, and I should like to say a word or two before the motion is made.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, on March 13, 1950, President Truman sent to Congress his Reorganization Plan No. 11 providing for a reorganization of the Federal Communications Commission. He stated that many benefits and improved operations would result from the adoption of this plan. The substance of the plan is contained in section 1, which transfers from the Federal Communications Commission as a whole to the Chairman of the Commission "the Executive and administrative functions of the Commission, including: First, the appointment and supervision of personnel employed under the Commission; second, the distribution of business among such personnel and administrative units of the Commission; and third, the use and expenditure of funds."

The proposed transfer of such tremendous authority and power to the Chairman of the Commission is so broad it carries with it many implications. It gives the Chairman of the Commission virtually complete control over the Commission's purse strings, the selection of its staff, and the assignment of all its work. While the plan says that the Chairman's actions in these respects would be subject to general policies of the Commission, and his appointments of heads of major administrative units subject to the approval of the Commission, it is obvious that in nearly all cases, he will be able to carry out his ideas over any opposition which minority members of the Commission may offer. It is almost certain that his majority colleagues on the Commission will in most cases support everything that he does. The reorganization plan has the potential effect of making the FCC a one-man agency, and the probable effect of upsetting the bipartisan character under which regulatory agencies are intended to function.

Mr. President, the law requires that this agency be a bipartisan agency, and therefore it is very material, first, whether we will give to the Chairman, who is named by the President, the power of appointment of and supervision over personnel employed under the Commission; second, the distribution of business among such personnel and administrative units of the Commission; and, third, the use and the expenditures of funds.

Certainly it is true that in the United States, where it is so important that the people be informed of the issues of the day, where radio fills such a large and important niche in the daily lives of the people and where such great efforts have been made in the past with well-known success, to preserve the freedom of speech guaranteed by the first amendment to the Constitution—certainly here it is important to make certain that radio does not fall under the thumb of a dictator. If this should take place, many of the civil rights of the citizenry would conceivably be placed in jeopardy. The possibility of such a sad result is so alarming as to justify a complete examination of this reorganization plan and in fact a reexamination of the whole

work of the FCC and its policies in regulating radio.

The Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has completed its study of the reorganization plan, and by a closely divided vote has approved it. This approval is no doubt premised on the fact that plan No. 11 is in conformance with the general recommendations of the Hoover Commission. Without applying its recommendations specifically to particular regulatory agencies, the Commission in its first recommendation in the Report on Regulatory Agencies said:

We recommend that all administrative responsibility be vested in the Chairman of the Commission.

The sharp division within the Expenditures Committee on this plan reveals the plan's weakness. While it is in general conformance with the Hoover report, it is no more than general. Moreover, it contains within it a concentration of authority, which is especially vital in an agency that is of necessity so reliant upon its technical staffs as is the FCC, which goes far beyond the purposes of efficiency upon which were based the Hoover recommendations for clearly defined lines of responsibility.

The Senate has already taken cognizance of the peculiar reliance upon its legal staff in the FCC. The Senate has unanimously approved S. 973, which has the effect of stripping the Commission's legal staff of some of its tremendous unseen influence in the workings of the Commission by creating independent legal counsel to assist the individual Commissioners in the discharge of their duties. It is not without significance, as revealing a jealous determination to preserve the influence now exerted by the Commission's legal staff, that S. 973 has been vigorously opposed in the House. It is an open secret that the Sadowski bill, a substitute for S. 973 in the House, was written by the Commission's legal staff to preserve and protect its present prerogatives.

The FCC is widely known to be dominated by the "liberal" Democrats who serve on the Commission and who permeate its staff.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. Is it not the understanding of the Senator from Michigan that Reorganization Plan No. 11, if it goes into effect, will nullify the action of the Senate in giving legal counsel to each individual member?

Mr. FERGUSON. I would not go that far. I do not think it would nullify it, but it would certainly allow the Chairman to make the appointments, which would in effect nullify the action of the Senate.

Mr. BRICKER. That is practically the same thing, is it not?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. BRICKER. Each Commissioner would have a legal counsel assigned to him, appointed by the Chairman, a legal counsel who is responsible to the Chairman and removable by the Chairman.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think that is the way the language of the plan reads.

The "big Government" philosophy which these people apply to the regulation of radio is threatening the radio industry and the people themselves to an extent which has become very, very dangerous to the Nation's welfare. These members of the Commission and, perhaps to even a greater extent, these members of the Commission staff, must be checked and their powers limited if freedom of speech is to prevail as an overriding principle in the political makeup of our country.

Mr. President, a previous member of the Commission went to England, and had some Englishmen come to this country to make an analysis of our radio system. That analysis was such that if the recommendations contained in it had been adopted, the radio broadcasting industry in America would have been placed under the same domination as the radio broadcasting industry in Britain, which is government-owned. I wish the commissions composing a part of the United States Government would begin thinking about America, and the way America may progress, rather than take their cues and their hints from other nations which are bent upon totalitarianism or socialization.

During the past 16 years, since its establishment by the Communications Act of 1934, the Federal Communications Commission has increasingly expanded its power of regulation in a manner which the framers of the Communications Act did not intend. It has succeeded in expanding these powers, perhaps to a much greater extent than many of us realize, and today stands in a position, if its power is not checked here and now, to throttle and ruin any radio station licensee it sees fit to discipline. The Commission is now attempting to expand these powers still further, and if this move is successful it is certain that the radio industry will be forced to give up even the fiction of free enterprise.

Why did a Federal Communications Commissioner bring to the United States from Great Britain men who were familiar with the British system to make a survey of our system and tell us how we ought to operate? I think we should keep that incident in mind when discussing this subject.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LONG in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. BRICKER. Is it not true at the present time that under the licensing system of the FCC, the Federal Communications Commission can deny a renewal of a license of any broadcasting company?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. BRICKER. And is there any appeal from that decision on the part of the licensee?

Mr. FERGUSON. I understand not. I think somehow the licensee can get into the courts, but it is a very difficult

proceeding, and it is very doubtful that the licensee has the right to challenge the actual finding of the Commission.

Mr. BRICKER. And the burden of proof is entirely upon the licensee, is it not?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. BRICKER. Many companies have invested many hundreds of thousands of dollars and many millions of dollars in radio stations and in the stuffs they have built up. Is it possible for the Federal Communications Commission under the present law completely to confiscate that investment and that property by the refusal of a renewal of the license?

Mr. FERGUSON. The Commission can wipe out all investments in a station; yes.

Mr. BRICKER. And from that there is no appeal?

Mr. FERGUSON. From that there is no appeal.

Mr. BRICKER. Except through the injunctive powers of the courts?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. President, it is even possible that the proposed expansion of the Commission's power can lead to complete Government ownership and operation of the radio industry. Let us examine the way in which this change has taken place and the way in which it can proceed.

The Communications Act of 1934 provides that radio licenses shall be granted where the "public interest, convenience, or necessity" will be served. This is the only criterion specified in the act which the Commission is given to follow in granting original applications for new stations. The vagueness of this term certainly requires that the Commission, in exercising the authority delegated to it by the Congress in this act, shall scrupulously avoid arbitrary decisions and, at all costs, refrain from violating the rights and privileges of individuals or companies holding station licenses by judging them on rumor or on unsupported allegations.

The primary function of the FCC is one of acting as a traffic policeman, an agent to ration facilities which have been said to be in short supply. While even this theory may be an impractical and indefensible legal fiction, it is certainly true that the Commission's technical functions of allocating frequencies is, under the statute creating it, its primary function. In dealing with stations already operating, the Commission is given the function of policing various prohibitions in the Communications Act. For example, a radio-station licensee may not transmit over the air waves any obscene, indecent, or profane language, nor may it broadcast information about lotteries. The framers of the Communications Act felt that the "public interest, convenience, and necessity" would not be served if such things were allowed.

Now it should be noted that the Communications Act provides that a person desiring a license to operate a radio station or a person desiring a license presently in force to be renewed, as licenses must be every 3 years, must set forth facts in his application to the Commission showing the "citizenship, character,

and financial, technical, and other qualifications" of the applicant to operate the station. It is clear what is meant here by "citizenship" and by the "financial" and "technical" qualifications of the applicant to operate the station. But what is meant by the "character" of an applicant or a licensee? What sort of a "character" did the framers of this law have in mind to be required of an applicant or licensee? What sort of a "character" does the Commission believe should be required of an applicant or licensee? Upon the answers to these questions much may depend.

An examination of the legislative history of the Communications Act gives no substantial clue to the intent of the Congress in its use of the word "character" at the time of the enactment of the law.

But the actions of the Commission in the past and the interpretation given to this word by the courts in the past makes amply clear what the Commission has believed. And today, at a time when increasing regulation of private enterprise by the Federal Government is certainly the political fashion and certainly the primary motivation of the Fair Deal administration, the Commission seems bent upon expanding the meaning of this word "character" and thereby tremendously expanding its own power over the radio industry.

No one can disagree with some of the policy decisions of the Commission in dealing in the past with applicants for new licenses or for renewals of current licenses. Certainly one who gives false information in his application for a license cannot be said to have the character which should be required of a radio station owner. Certainly one cannot disagree with the Commission's policy of denying licenses to owners who repeatedly violate technical rules of the Commission, to owners who transfer control of their stations to others without the Commission's approval, in violation of the act, to owners who operate deficient equipment, or to owners who repeatedly broadcast false advertising or other objectionable matter.

However, Mr. President, in passing it should be noted that even in many of the cases described above—notably, in those dealing with false advertising, the use of deficient equipment, or violation of technical rules—the Commission has renewed the license when it was satisfied that the violation or other action to which it objected was unintentional and when it was satisfied that such action would not again occur.

It is also hard to disagree with the Commission's position, upheld by the Supreme Court, that in considering character it should scrutinize the applicant's qualities and deficiencies regarding traits of personality, integrity, temperament, consideration, sportsmanship, altruism, and so forth, which distinguish him as a human being from his fellow-men.

As I have said, that position has been upheld by the Supreme Court, but only in a case involving an application for the transfer of control of a radio station when serious doubt arose as to the integrity of the proposed transferee. The broad scope thus given to the authority

to conduct a character investigation was applied only to a new applicant for whom no other test was available.

However, Mr. President, what is the Commission attempting to do today? In Los Angeles there have been a series of hearings on the requested renewal of the licenses of three radio stations, namely, Station KMPC, in Los Angeles; Station WJR, in Detroit; and Station WGAR, in Cleveland. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Barmes] brought these hearings to the attention of the Senate on March 30, on the floor of the Senate.

The principal stockholder of those stations is Mr. George A. Richards. Mr. Richards has operated those stations with public approval for a period ranging from 13 years, in the case of Station KMPC, to 23 years, in the case of Station WJR. These stations have a long history of fine programming and excellent public service, and they have the reputation of having met with the utmost, complete approval on the part of the citizens of the communities in which they are located. I personally can attest that that is true in the case of Station WJR.

Mr. President, if the radio industry and the people of the United States were to choose and had the right to choose, I am positive they would place these stations within the first 10 stations in the United States of America.

Throughout the years, as the license of each of those stations has come up for renewal from time to time—and as I have said, the stations have operated over a period of from 13 to 23 years respectively—the Commission has held hearings on the proposed renewals; and at the hearings, governors, mayors, representatives, charitable and religious organizations, representatives of veterans' organizations, and representatives of universities and colleges have all attested to the fine record of public service of these stations.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BRICKER. Inasmuch as one of the stations mentioned is in Ohio—namely, Station WGAR—I wish to join the Senator from Michigan and those whom he has quoted in praising the quality of the programs and the community service rendered by that station, which has operated for some 20 years in my State.

Is it the understanding of the Senator from Michigan that the charges heard at the hearing have not reflected upon the program or the character of service rendered in the respective communities by that station and the other two, but, rather, have taken on the aspect of an attack upon the political thinking of the principal stockholder of those companies?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the distinguished junior Senator from Ohio is absolutely correct in that statement. The charges made are not attacks on the operation of the stations or the programs or the programming of the stations, but they are attacks on the character of the principal stockholder of the stations and what he, individually, thinks.

I hope to cover that point a little later in the course of my remarks.

I thank the Senator for stating on the floor of the Senate what he thinks of Station WGAR, in Cleveland. It is a high-powered station, as is Station WJR. I think both of them are 50,000-watt stations. We in Detroit on occasion hear the Cleveland station. I have never heard anything but the best of radio over that station, as I have also said about Station WJR, in Detroit.

Mr. President, the character and the fitness of these stations and of Mr. Richards have, before now, never been questioned during all the period in which he has been the principal stockholder of these stations.

Nevertheless, now the Commission is threatening a refusal to renew the license of the stations in question, and is taking that position because of irresponsible allegations made against the character of Mr. Richards. Some of those allegations have been made by disgruntled ex-employees who were discharged because of inefficiency. Some of those allegations have been made by politicians. At this point, reference particularly should be made to a complaint written on the stationery of the Democratic State Committee of California. That complaint is the reason why I have said that some of the allegations have been made by politicians. That complaint was sent to the Commission by Mr. James Roosevelt, an active and an extremely vocal candidate for the Democratic nomination for Governor of the great State of California.

Mr. Richards was once a Democrat; but he disagreed with the breaking of the third-term tradition, and in 1940 he broke with the Democratic Party. Certainly, therefore, as the Senator from New Hampshire has pointed out, the presently threatened action on the part of the Commission, after its receipt of a strong complaint from a member of the Roosevelt family, who is so active in Democratic politics, should be regarded with considerable skepticism. The charges made against Mr. Richards and filed with the Commission relate to alleged opinions which Mr. Richards is said to have held concerning certain prominent persons, including Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, the wife of a former President of the United States; Howard Hughes; David Lilienthal, who was Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission; Henry Wallace, who was Vice President of the United States; and others.

It is further charged that Mr. Richards instructed members of his station staff of news casters to slant or distort the news reports relating to those individuals, so that nothing favorable about them would be reported but so that anything unfavorable about them would be reported over his stations.

He is further alleged to have ordered that all possible help be given to the Republican Party by those news casters in their writings and the delivery of news script.

Mr. President, it is something new when a charge is made that radio stations are attempting to give at least some help to the Republican Party and what it is attempting to do.

As I understand, there is absolutely no evidence, however, that the facilities of Mr. Richards' stations were being used to transmit over the airways any of Mr. Richards' private opinions.

Mr. President, I understand from reliable sources that during the course of these hearings, proof has been offered that Mr. Richards did on occasion issue instructions to his station employees to treat specific news items and general subjects in certain ways, which some persons might characterize as not being impartial. However, there is absolutely no credible proof in the record that any of those instructions to station employees ever were carried out and that biased or slanted newscasts were put on the air.

Mr. President, I wish to repeat that, because it answers the question which has been asked by the distinguished junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER]—namely, there is absolutely no credible proof that any of those instructions to station employees ever were carried out and that biased or slanted newscasts were put on the air.

It may be asked: Why, then, does it matter to the Commission what Mr. Richards may have said to his employees?

It may be asked: Is not Mr. Richards entitled to his private opinions, and is he not to be allowed to freely express those opinions?

Mr. President, I must confess that answers to these questions detrimental to Mr. Richards are not apparent to me on logical grounds. But it is certainly apparent that, with or without logic to base such action on, the Commission is attempting here to penalize Richards because of his privately expressed views, and because of his private opinions. The fact that those opinions did not happen to coincide with those of the Commission and its staff, especially with respect to matters relating to national politics, is certainly to be regarded as significant. And the fact that the Commission's own evidence begins with events in 1940, when Mr. Richards departed from the Democratic fold and became critical of President Roosevelt, is more than significant.

In other words, in this Richards case, the Commission is departing from past practice and is threatening to penalize the majority stockholder of these radio stations, which stations have an impeccable public service record, because of this stockholder's privately voiced opinions, contrary to those of the Commission, which never reached the air waves. This may be highly questionable for the Commission to do even in the case of initial applications for new station licenses where there has been no investment by the applicant, where no large labor force has been allowed, and where no loss to the community in radio service will result. But where the opposite is true I can conceive of no necessity for the same strict standards of character, the same type of evidence being required, the same criteria being applied with respect to stations and station licensees who have operated for years without criticism and without complaint. Is proven public service to count for

nothing? Certainly where there is a station in existence, applying for a renewal of its license after long years of public service, the Commission should require credible evidence that biased or false statements actually were broadcast before the station could be deprived of its license, and the performance record of the station itself should be the test.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BRICKER. The Senator from Michigan has detailed the character of the hearing against Mr. Richards, who happens to be a majority stockholder. If the Commission has power to look into the private thinking and expressions even of a majority stockholder, it has the same right as to a minority stockholder, has it not?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. BRICKER. The evidence shows that even though he be a majority stockholder, there is nothing in the programs of the stations concerned to show that the advice or suggestions or thinking of the majority stockholder had anything to do with the character of the programs any more than if he had been a minority stockholder. Is that not true?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is true. So it would not make any difference whether he was a minority stockholder or a majority stockholder; they could consider his thinking and determine whether, by his thinking, his character was so marred, in their opinion, according to their thinking, that he would not be entitled to a renewal of his license.

Mr. BRICKER. And in that way, even if a minority stockholder held opinions adverse to the Commission's judgment of what was wholesome, if they could do it in this case, they could positively do it in that case, confiscating the property, and all the rest; could they not?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. There could be a pure confiscation.

Mr. President, even in cases where objectionable material can be shown to have been actually broadcast, should it not be required that station licenses be revoked rather than that the Commission should merely fail to renew such licenses? In other words, in these cases they are not asking to revoke the licenses, for in that event, there would have to be a hearing. In a revocation proceeding, the licensee would be given complete notice of the charges against him; he would be given a bill of particulars, setting forth in detail the questionable practices of which he is suspected. He would be put on guard and given time to prepare a defense for his own protection.

But in a proceeding such as the one in the Richards' case, where the Commission has allowed the station licenses to lapse and has then set down for hearing the licensee's applications for renewal, resisting all efforts of counsel to obtain details with respect to the charges leveled against the licensee by complainants, there can be no question but that the Commission is proceeding unfairly. In the Richards' case, the record indicates clearly that counsel for Mr. Richards has attempted on many occasions

to obtain some idea of the suspicions which the Commission had as a result of the charges filed with it. These attempts were made through motions, through prehearing conferences, and through verbal efforts at the beginning of and throughout the hearings. These efforts were all to no avail. Commission counsel would state only in the vaguest and broadest terms what Mr. Richards was charged with. Only because some of the complaints filed with the Commission had been in part carried in trade papers did this licensee have even an inkling of the details of these complaints.

In other words, here is a case where the one who was really the defendant, whose property and that of the other stockholders was about to be confiscated, had to get the information as to the charges from trade papers. The Commission would not furnish the charges to him. Commission counsel certainly made no effort to help and in fact refused to help along this line.

Can it be doubted that this method of proceeding is unfair and not in accordance with our American traditions of jurisprudence? Is this proceeding in itself not substantial evidence that the FCC is attempting to enlarge and expand its powers of regulation, to the detriment of the public and without consideration being given to the deprivation of legal rights which such parties as Mr. Richards have suffered? It seems to me that if the Senate of the United States does not act now, and positively, to stave off this attempt by the FCC to expand its powers, the Federal Communications Commission will succeed again and again in the future.

Opposition to any reorganization plan, even when it is no more than in general conformity to Hoover Commission recommendations, is difficult for anyone who is pledged, as I am, to the Hoover plan for economy and efficiency in government.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BRICKER. As I understand, there is no suggestion in the President's Reorganization Plan No. 11 that there would be any savings of money in any amount.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

I feel justified in recording opposition to Reorganization Plan No. 11, first, because it is no more than in general conformance with the Hoover plan; second, because I believe the great purpose of the Hoover plan is to be achieved by its enactment as a whole, rather than a nibbling at the edges without getting at entrenched inefficiency in Government; third, because this plan promises no appreciable savings, which is the main purpose of the Hoover plan, and in reality only employs the Hoover Commission as a device to demand greater and more arbitrary authority; fourth, because the exercise of such concentrated authority in the FCC, on the basis of the record, is to be mistrusted.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. I do not think there is any implication or any suggestion at all that the powers over the appointment of the staff and the power over the allocation of money and the assignment of responsibility should be reposed in the Chairman. I do not think there is any positive recommendation to that effect, is there?

Mr. FERGUSON. I have found no such recommendation in the Hoover reports. The idea is to produce greater efficiency and bring about more economy.

Mr. BRICKER. Does the Senator understand that the Hoover Commission report simply recommended that the chairman be given more administrative responsibility?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is the way it is worded. The President has now recommended giving him the power to hire, to discharge, to assign work, and to spend the money.

Mr. BRICKER. Does the distinguished Senator distinguish between executive powers, which would include the over-all management and control of the Commission, and administrative powers, which involve merely the assignment of cases and the assignment of responsibility?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. The powers would be in the nature of those of a presiding judge having cases assigned to the calendar.

Mr. BRICKER. Even in the case of the reorganization and the supposed efficiency and economy which might result from it, there is nothing in the recommended Reorganization Plan No. 11 which really follows the Hoover Commission's recommendations, is there?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

The plan surrenders to a single person authority over the selection and assignment of the personnel who by and large govern the operations of one of the most important regulatory agencies we have. It is the agency which by the nature of the field in which it operates is potentially the greatest thought-control medium in the Nation.

We have had enough of the planners, the charterers, and the lawyers in Government who tell us how and when to buy and sell, and would even tell us how to think.

It is not enough to warn against arbitrary power in the hands of the planners, charterers, and lawyers. If we cannot exercise control over them on the ground level of their functions, through their appointment, we can only protest against them after the fact. It can then be too late.

In other words, Mr. President, the department was conducted by lawyers, planners, and charterers. Tell any Senator what the lawyers, planners, and charterers think in the commissions and bureaus, and they will know how the commission or the bureau is going to be operated. The question is, are we going to place in the Chairman, particularly in the case of a nonpartisan Commission, the power to control freedom of speech and of thought over the radio?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator on some of the statements he is making regarding the very disastrous effects of the abuse of power by agencies of Government. Since none of us will be able to speak on the FEPC matter this afternoon, I wondered if the Senator would permit me to amend his speech by striking out "FCC" and inserting in lieu thereof "FEPC," because the FEPC would have even more powers to deny the people control over their thoughts and opinions than would the Commission to which the Senator is referring.

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not believe I shall be able to accommodate the Senator by striking out "FCC" and inserting "FEPC," because I do want my statement to apply to the Federal Communications Commission.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to ask the Senator if he will be kind enough to consider the powers embraced in the FEPC bill when he has concluded his remarks about the FCC. He will find this new bureau it is proposed to create has much greater powers than the FCC. I thank the Senator for permitting this word of opposition to FEPC today.

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not know that I can accommodate the distinguished Senator in that respect.

I hope that notwithstanding the majority views of the Senate Expenditures Committee that the Senate will examine most carefully Reorganization Plan No. 11, and its implications. I hope on the basis of such an examination that the Senate will reject the plan, at least until we are possessed of adequate assurances that the authority vested by the plan cannot and will not be abused in any way.

To explore that subject further I suggest that there should be a complete and thorough investigation by the Senate of the policies and procedures of the Federal Communications Commission.

In support of that suggestion I submit a resolution adopted by the executive committee of the American Legion for the Department of Michigan, which I ask unanimous consent to place in the Record following my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

CENSORSHIP OF RADIO

Whereas the Federal Communications Commission is currently conducting a hearing to determine whether a man's personal opinions render him unfit to operate radio stations in the United States; and

Whereas it appears that the Federal Communications Commission's power to censor radio by refusing periodical requests for renewal of a station's license to operate goes beyond the intent of Congress in establishing the FCC and outlining its duties; and

Whereas the present system of operation of the FCC enables powerful political interests to bring undue pressure and influence to bear for or against radio stations seeking license renewals: Therefore be it

Resolved by the executive committee, Department of Michigan, the American Legion, in spring conference assembled in Detroit this 19th day of March 1950, That inquiry